

Summary and Unedited Public Comments for Chapter 13: Transportation

Below is a summary of public comments with staff responses and actions along with the unedited comments for draft Chapter 13: Transportation.

Summary of Public Comments for Chapter 13: Transportation						
Comment Summary #	Comment Summary	Staff Response	Action			
			Incorporated	Not Incorporated	Another Chapter	Beyond Scope of Plan
1	Can sidewalk be extended a part of project 107089 on Robious Rd?	Bicycle and pedestrian improvements are planned through the project limits. Extending them beyond that is outside the scope of the project and not included in the budget.				X
2	Concern over high speed rail	High speed rail is a state/federal project and included in the Plan for informational purposes only.				X
3	What do the points on the map indicate on page TR 19?	A link will be added to the final document that will provide an index of the projects	X			
4 (11 comments)	Concerns regarding the need for the East/West Freeway	The East/West Freeway is necessary to meet current and future transportation needs and to provide for desired patterns of development in the county.	X			
5	Important to improve intersections for pedestrians and to have good pedestrian facilities for transit connections	Concur. If transit is expanded to additional parts of the county, additional pedestrian infrastructure will be necessary.	X			
6	The cross sections in Chapter 13 and Chapter 14 seem to be inconsistent	Staff will update Chapter 13 & 14 cross sections to make a stronger connection between the chapters.	X			

Summary of Public Comments for Chapter 13: Transportation						
Comment Summary #	Comment Summary	Staff Response	Action			
			Incorporated	Not Incorporated	Another Chapter	Beyond Scope of Plan
7	Specific comments regarding the Midlothian area	Comments regarding the Midlothian Community Special Area Plan will be incorporated into that plan process			X	
8	Special Area Plan needed in the southern Huguenot Road area	Chapter 11 Special Area Plans identifies the Huguenot/60 area as a potential future SAP	X		X	
9	Concern that the emphasis on “context sensitive road designs” could limit connective transportation infrastructure like bike lanes or sidewalks should the context of a road be deemed “rural.” Language that promotes multi-modal connectivity in all practical contexts would be preferable.	We understand the concern, but there are ordinances and policies that require the provision of sidewalks and bike lanes regardless of the rural context		X		
10	Suggestion to divide the chapter into 3 sections	Disagree – current chapter structure achieves desired purposes		X		
11	Establish section to investigate transit alternatives	New guideline added on page TR 28	X			

Unedited Public Comments for Chapter 13: Transportation

Comment Summary #	Unedited Comment
Comment Summary #1	The plan looks pretty solid. My only suggestion is regarding project 107089 - Robious Road county line to Robious Forest Way---as part of that widening project, can we get sidewalks extended to connect to the sidewalks that stop at Robious and Sandhurst? It seems like it would be more cost effective to do the sidewalks now versus waiting for a few years and then going back in and doing more engineering and right of way studies later.
Comment Summary #2, 3, 4	Why do we insist on a high speed rail line? Recent experience in California has resulted in no rail service and an overbudget project which is no where near completion. I don't see how this would become profitable or at least a break even deal for the tax payers. What is the need for this when so many people insist on driving? Page 19...you have numbered pin points on the map yet there is no explanation of them included anywhere. Please show us what each of these numbered points are. East West beltway....perhaps we have seen enough growth and development in the county and would like to continue our current life styles. Nothing wrong with undeveloped parts of the County.
Comment Summary #5, 6, 7, 8	<p>Dear Planners, These comments are on the draft Transportation Chapter (Chapter 13) of the Comprehensive Plan. My primary concern relates to how it and other chapters of the Comprehensive plan deal with pedestrian issues in the county. The benefits of non-motorized transportation are well presented in the introduction to the draft Chapter 14. These comments are on six topics: I. Safe intersections (TR 6-7). II. Transit (TR 20) and the relationship of walking to transit. III. New development and walking (TR 27). IV. The cross-sections in Chapter 13 (TR 8-11), compared with those in Chapter 14. V. The highway network (TR 12, 13) as it relates to walking in the Midlothian village and Hull Street Road areas. VI. Need for a Special Area Plan (TR 7, 13) for the southern Huguenot Road area.</p> <p>I. Safe intersections. Summary: The "Safe Intersections for All" subsection identifies the critical need in the county related to pedestrian safety. A special planning study would be desirable to address that need. Discussion: The single most important paragraph on pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure in the Comprehensive Plan is on TR 7: Safe Intersections for All Intersections of roads are often barriers to safe walking and biking. Many roads are built with sidewalks, but it is not possible to safely cross the road without a pedestrian actuated signal, signage and/or road markings. Existing intersections should be redesigned and standards for new intersections should be established to encourage biking and walking, especially in areas where sidewalks currently exist or if the intersection appears on the Bikeways and Trails Plan. To see why this is so important, consider the planned Winterpock Shared Use Path. The south end of this path is at the entrance to the Birkdale neighborhood, and beyond that the Deer Run neighborhood across Spring Run Road. So there is a large population of potential users of the path. But the north end of this path is at Hull Street Road. Hull Street Road has six miles of sidewalks west of 288, but for the Winterpock Shared Use Path to realize its full potential, it has to become possible for "everyone including persons with disabilities" to safely get from sidewalk to sidewalk across the numerous busy intersections along Hull Street Road to reach desired destinations along or beyond Hull Street Road. An area in the county that has a safe pedestrian environment is the village of Chester, which has 2.5 miles of sidewalk on each side of West Hundred Road (Route 10), five intersections on Route 10 with highly visible crosswalks and pedestrian timers to cross Route 10 and to connect sidewalks along Route 10, additional highly visible crosswalks across minor streets feeding into Route 10, and sidewalks along several of the side streets leading into Route 10. "Safe Intersections for All" has been implemented in Chester. Why not also in other built-up areas of the county? A county-wide planning study</p>

is needed that will follow up on the Safe Intersections for All recommendations and focus on possibilities for and obstacles to short (under 1.5 mile) walking and bicycling trips as transportation. One outcome of such a planning study should be to prepare a list of projects, ordered by priority, that will make the greatest difference for the least cost in increasing the use of the sidewalk assets the County already has. To add crosswalks and countdown pedestrian signals to a four-way intersection with existing sidewalks costs perhaps \$25,000, or about one percent of the cost of constructing a mile of sidewalk, based on the cost of the Harrowgate sidewalk project (under construction this fall). So identifying and funding intersection improvements is a low-cost way to make a large positive impact on the pedestrian environment in the county.

II. Transit. Summary: The discussion of transit omits the need for pedestrian infrastructure at intersections near transit stops, necessary to enable patrons to cross highways to reach the stops. Discussion: On page TR 20, discussing Transit, we find Additional information/considerations Infrastructure enhancements are required to optimize performance: Additional pedestrian infrastructure (sidewalks and paved shoulders) to provide access to potential transit locations ADA compliant stops placed in accessible and walkable areas Installation of traffic signals and right-turn lanes at intersections where buses will be turning around for safety and schedule adherence Not mentioned is the need for pedestrian signals at nearby signalized intersections. When pedestrians cannot safely cross Hull Street Road, or Midlothian Turnpike, or Jefferson Davis Highway, or Huguenot Road, how can they reach a bus stop on the opposite side of the highway?

III. New development and walking. Summary: Infill development should help with improvements to adjacent intersections. Discussion: On TR 27 is found: Zoning and Development Proposals. Support development proposals that: ... Achieve development integration in accordance with The Land Use Plan chapter to improve local traffic movements and pedestrian accessibility. Look for improvements with development in accordance with the Bikeways and Trails plan. Connectivity. Encourage new developments to provide bikeways, sidewalks and other pedestrian facilities where appropriate.... For infill developments, the paragraph on Safe Intersections for All is particularly relevant. A new development may provide sidewalks on its frontage, but if the new sidewalks remain separated from existing sidewalks by busy intersections with no pedestrian signals, then the sidewalk investment is of no value. The new Lidl at the corner of Mall Road and Koger Center Boulevard is an example. I hope the County will work with VDOT to ensure that new infill development is able to help make adjacent intersections pedestrian-friendly.

IV. Cross-sections (TR 8-11). The cross sections in Chapter 13 (which have no bike lanes) seem to be inconsistent with the cross sections in Chapter 14 (which do). More explanation on how they relate would be helpful.

V. The Highway Network and walking (TR 12, 13). Summary: Extending the Powhite, expanding Old Hundred Road west of Charter Colony Parkway to a major arterial, building the East-West Freeway, and providing a direct connection west from Woolridge Road at 288 to Old Hundred Road would all reduce through traffic on Midlothian Turnpike in the village and on Hull Street Road west of 288, and make pedestrian improvements at intersections along those roads more acceptable from a traffic flow standpoint. Discussion: The three main highway routes from Richmond toward western Virginia are I-64, US 60 and US 360. US 60 goes through Midlothian village, and US 360 includes the dense commercial area between 288 and Woodlake Village Parkway. Both areas are pedestrian nightmares--while both highways in those areas have sidewalks along both sides, it is virtually impossible to cross either highway on foot most hours of the day. When the issue of adding pedestrian signals at intersections on Hull Street Road came up,

for example at the Winterpock Road widening public meeting a year ago, I was told that VDOT was concerned with pedestrian signals because they would impede through traffic on an important state highway. The best long-term solution to make pedestrian crossings more acceptable on Hull Street Road and on Midlothian Turnpike is to provide bypasses for through traffic.

i. Hull Street Road. At the present time, through traffic heading out of Richmond for southwest Virginia can take the Powhite but then must get off at 288 and take Hull Street Road to head west. (In my experience, well over half the afternoon peak hour traffic coming south on 288 gets off at the Amelia exit onto Hull Street Road.) If the Powhite (TR 12,13) were extended to Skinquarter, then Hull Street Road no longer would carry that through traffic, and VDOT's reluctance to slowing traffic down to permit pedestrians and bicyclists to cross the highway should be mitigated. There was no discussion on TR 13 about the East-West Freeway, but if completed as shown on the map on TR 13, that highway would also draw through traffic that now uses Hull Street Road and the eastern part of 288.

ii. Midlothian Turpike in the village. Public input for the Midlothian Special Area Study yielded many comments from residents who want to preserve the village feel and, in particular, make walking and bicycling in the village much more viable. But it's hard to have a village feel with high volumes of traffic on Midlothian Turnpike. So, just as with Hull Street Road, creating attractive bypasses for through traffic could mitigate VDOT's reluctance to impede traffic flow on US 60 with pedestrian signals in the village. Some bypasses are already available. I did some experiments on Google Maps: A trip from Midlothian Turnpike at Courthouse Road to Anderson Highway, Route 60 in Powhatan: via North Woolridge Rd. and 288 the trip is 1.8 miles longer and typically takes 2 minutes longer compared to staying on Midlothian Turnpike. A trip from the Powhite Parkway north of Route 60 to Anderson Highway in Powhatan: via 76, 288 and 60 the trip is 3 miles longer but typically takes 2-12 minutes less time than via 76 and Midlothian Turnpike; via 76 and Old Hundred Road (Route 652) the trip is 2.3 miles longer but typically takes 0-10 minutes less time than via 76 and Midlothian Turnpike. At present Old Hundred Road between Charter Colony Parkway and Route 60 is just a two-lane road between Watermill Parkway and US 60. To make bypasses of Midlothian Turnpike around the village more attractive, it would be desirable to: expand Old Hundred Road to a Major Arterial (as shown on TR 14), adopting the Access Management ideas on page TR 6 but being careful to retain a safe pedestrian and bicycle environment near the new schools. A shared use path would be desirable along Old Hundred Road to connect the new schools to Hallsley and to the county bicycle network to the east; build a similarly designed arterial connector (not shown on TR 14) from the 288-N. Woolridge intersection straight west to Old Hundred Road at or near Brightwalton Road to create a North Woolridge-new connector-Old Hundred Road bypass. These improvements should make both the Powhite-Old Hundred route and the North Woolridge/288 route or North Woolridge-new connector-Old Hundred Road route faster and more attractive as bypasses around Midlothian village, and thereby help make Midlothian village a safer, less congested, and more walkable community. Hopefully the planned West Midlothian Special Area study will consider these ideas.

VI. Summary: A Special Area Study is badly needed in the southern Huguenot Road area. Discussion: Chapter 13 (TR 7) suggests that pedestrian improvements could come out of Special Area Plans. I wish to propose another SAP, specifically, for the area within a one mile radius of Lowes on Koger Center Parkway. This part of the county is very much in need of a Special Area study, for these reasons: the doubtful future of large scale onsite retailing such as Chesterfield Town Center; the general overbuilding of retail in the area (e. g. the empty

	<p>Martin's); an almost complete lack of walkability for the dense residential population nearby, which contributed to the failure of bus service between the Lowes parking lot and downtown Richmond, and hurts local businesses in the area; the traffic congestion (see TR 13), and the VCU study finding that this area has the largest imbalance between low-wage jobs and affordable housing in the entire Richmond region. These comments are submitted in response to the Transportation chapter (13). If they are also appropriate in response to other chapters (such as Chapters 11 or 14) or to other planning studies in progress (such as the Midlothian SAP), could these be forwarded to the appropriate staff? Thank you. Respectfully submitted.</p>
Comment Summary #4	<p>From: Bermuda Advocates for Responsible Development (BARD) Because of the continuing controversy over proposed zoning cases (ie: "Matoaca" Mega Site), proposed routes, proposed right of way acquisition, and most importantly, resident's opposition, I believe the E-W Freeway should be REMOVED from the Comprehensive Plan. Instead, I advocate for commitments in the Comp. Plan for the County to maintain and improve existing road infrastructure in Chesterfield (example: Branders Bridge Road, Nash Road, and many others). This would include advocating actively for State and Federal monies for those existing road improvements to the benefit of County residents, instead of pursuing additional new roads which would only serve commercial and industrial users, and expansion of that type of development into Southern Chesterfield, where residents do not want it.</p>
Comment Summary #4	<p>To Whom It May Concern, I am writing because I am a concerned citizen. I do not approve of the proposed East/West Free Way or Thoroughfare Plan. I live on Beechwood Ave which is about a mile from the proposed Mega Site and East/West Freeway. Currently Beechwood Ave does not have lines painted on the road to distinguish lanes or even a shoulder. Currently the project that is happening on Brandersbridge Road (Shoosmith digging site) has numerous dump trucks passing by my house on a regular basis. I have had to replace a mailbox twice (along with several other neighbors) due to the fact that these trucks come down our road and are unable to safely pass one another. I tried calling the county to address this issue and see what it would take to have Beechwood labeled as a "no thorough fare for trucks" but was advised that it would take over a year to go through and by that time the project the trucks were at would be finished with their job. I am realizing now that it was just a cover up for the county to allow them to make way for the Mega Site. I have lived in Chesterfield County my entire life. I love this place. But my husband and I have had serious discussions about moving since this Mega Site and Freeway have been proposed. I truly hope the county listens to its residents and moves this site elsewhere. There are plenty of locations in the Chesterfield area with better access to highway and rail systems than the site proposed. Good luck with your decisions. Sincerely.</p>
Comment Summary #4	<p>We are opposed to any development known as the E-W Freeway to the proposed Mega Site and N-S Road from the proposed Mega Site to Chester. This would displace county residents, drop property values in and around the area, cause increased traffic congestion outside of the megasite area, and cause increased taxpayer burden by the demolition and rebuilding of Harrowgate Elementary School. An industrial site in a rural mostly residential/agricultural area is a poorly thought-out idea. We are also opposed to any widening of Hickory Road (the speed and traffic already make it difficult, if not dangerous to get out of our driveway) or River Road. Those of us who live in this beautiful rural area stay here for a reason...it's a BEAUTIFUL RURAL AREA. We don't want it ruined. Sincerely,</p>

Comment Summary #4	Such a waste to spend tax money on a ghost site. Please do not disrupt so many lives with this project.
Comment Summary #4	I strongly recommend that the East West Freeway not be included in the Comprehensive Plan due to the fact in my opinion it is not needed. More roads are not needed and forests should be preserved to provide ambient clean air
Comment Summary #4	There should be no North South Road because the MEGA-SITE is bad idea. Placing Heavy Industry in the middle of residences is wrong. There are plenty of other sites that could accommodate heavy industry. Clearing timber at the Mega-site will decrease the ambient air quality. What will prevent the expansion of trash dumping in the Mega-site area should no heavy industry occupy the Mega-site?
Comment Summary #4	The comprehensive plan transportation draft is an extensive propaganda document to convenience people that the people in power know whats best for the taxpayers of Chesterfield County. The thoroughfare plan is ruining the reasons many people chose to live in Chesterfield County. Many resident of the Bermuda and Matoaca Districts chose to live there because of the rural nature of the area. These people enjoy open spaces, clean streams, trees, wildlife and no congestion from business or industries. If you are going to force development we don't want down our throats you should at least let the citizens vote on the type of development and create a transportation plan that the citizens want and not one developed by bureaucrats and told it will be "good" for us. This plan is not what many citizens of the affected areas want. We need more transportation that is not dependent on automobiles. More buses, trolleys, bike paths etc. rather than more roads, congestion, and pollution. If you want industrial growth keep it confined to the areas already zoned industrial in the county and served by the current road network. WE DON'T WANT TO BECOME ANOTHER CONGESTED AREA LIKE FAIRFAX!
Comment Summary #4	Apparently the county does not take existing citizens into account. The East/West expressway THROUGH EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AREAS will serve areas to be developed (ie out near 360) while harming the ESTABLISHED residential areas it goes through. Where is the wisdom in this? And I hear things about the new roads dumping off on Route 10 - Route 10 and Jeff-Davis is acknowledged to be one of th4r most dangerous intersections in thed county. This is not appropriate. I do not see any plans to allevieat the issues. All I see are plans to make it worse.
Comment Summary #4	Page 3 - "Many, many years"... how long is this? Please be more specific, 20, 30 years? people need to know land use issues over time, particularly given the problems with looming ROW purchases for the East West Freeway, which the county should have bought up or at least stalled development on. Page 4 - It's interesting you are sensitive to the community's desires to retain unique characteristics, such as Rt 10 and Chester Village. County isn't sensitive to this vis-a-vis Matoaca Megasite! Page 12 - "does not address all project capacity needs." Given the Megasite and EWF issues, the plan should be more specific. While the Comprehensive Plan is a GUIDE, if the county is going to use it as a point of reference in arguing FOR specific development, then the county needs to be at least a little more specific, providing more detail, so residents can plan on how to handle sale/purchase of properties.

<p>Comment Summary #4</p>	<p>The plan looks to be thorough. I understand the importance for planning for future growth. However, there doesn't appear to be a current need for building roads such as the East-West Freeway. Roads are not congested in that area. Not all of us want to live in an area like Hull Street or Midlothian Turnpike. I am opposed to this freeway, and think that it can wait until it is needed.</p>
<p>Comment Summary #9, 10, 11</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the Transportation Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. I would like to make the following comments on behalf of the Richmond Association of REALTORS®: 1. The street design segment, the new diagrams, and the collaboration fostered between developers and county staff are encouraging. It is important to us that that conversation remains open. That said, we are concerned that the emphasis on “context sensitive road designs” could limit connective transportation infrastructure like bike lanes or sidewalks should the context of a road be deemed “rural.” Language that promotes multi-modal connectivity in all practical contexts would be preferable. 2. The first half of the chapter pertaining to road infrastructure and the roads thoroughfare plan was well organized and thought out. It was clear, detailed, and placed responsibility for specific plans on the appropriate governmental entities. The second half of the chapter attempts to cover a wide array of alternative modes of transportation that are starkly different from one another, including bus service, passenger rail service, freight transportation, and air transportation. Because there are so many different topics being covered in the second half of the chapter, it might be more effective to divide the Transportation Chapter into three sections: Road Infrastructure; Multi-Modal Transportation; and Freight Transportation. 3. By establishing a section to investigate possible transit alternatives for the county’s residents, it will be easier to expound upon each method, propose specific goals, and assign the appropriate government entities the responsibilities to reach those goals. Thank you again for the opportunity to comment</p>